The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives news accounts and official interpretations of matters affecting labor concerning in the federal, legislative, and judicial fields, and contains other information of benefit to the trade union movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter December 10, 1915, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1126, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 12, 1918.

WHOLE NO. 1888 WILLIAM GREEN, President WASHINGTON, D. C., TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1947 GEORGE MEANY, Secretary-Treasurer VOL. 37, NO. 24

Write Your Senators And Congressman To Fight Anti-Labor Bills

Green Favors Bill To Admit More Displaced Persons

Washington, D. C.—AFL President William Green, in a statement before the House Judiciary Committee, supported the Stratton Bill which provides for the admission into this country of 400,000 displaced persons during the next five years.

Mr. Green pointed out that the proposed legislation is emergency in character which does not violate the principles of existing immigration laws regulating immigration on an annual quota basis.

The bill permits the entry into this country of displaced persons at a gradual rate of not more than 100,000 per year for the next four years and gives priority to relatives of American citizens. The persons may be admitted who does not conform to the regular American immigration standards of health, morals, democratic political beliefs and self support.

Citing the AFL's continued opposition to all forms of totalitarianism, Mr. Green said, "Those who oppose totalitarianism should certainly be sympathetic towards the victims of totalitarianism, the Displaced Persons. These people, who proved their devotion to democratic ideals, and their willingness to suffer for those ideals is ample evidence of the keenness of their convictions.

"For this reason, the American Federation of Labor at its 66th annual convention, held in Chicago last October, gave serious consideration to this most important problem. After careful deliberation, the convention unanimously recommended enactment of legislation to permit the unfilled quotas of the war period to be utilized for the entry into our country of these suffering Displaced Persons of Europe."

Concluding his remarks in support of the legislation, Mr. Green declared, that the President of the organization representing seven and one-half million workers, I am sensitive to any matter which would affect the condition of the working people as I returned veteran or a former war worker. H.R. 2910 will not have any adverse bearing on the American economy. More than 90 percent of the displaced persons are women and children who will be no job competitors. The small number adults in the President's group will be directed away from large cities, cannot have any serious effect upon our employment problem.

"On the contrary, there are agricultural workers, domestics, nurses, and skilled workers among the displaced, who will fill some of our present shortages and who will bring industrial and scientific skills to the United States. However, we are not in sympathy with those who would welcome these immigrants as a source of cheap labor and for that reason. We do believe that safeguards should be established to prevent such exploitation.

"We urge the passage of this legislation at this session of the United States as a demonstration to the world that it is truly the land of the free, the home of Freedom, but will also remain a place of refuge for those fleeing totalitarian oppression."

Truman Veto of Fake Tax Reduction Measure Paves Way For Rejection of Taft-Hartley Bill

President Says Tax Bill Is Untimely And Will Aid Rich More Than Poor

Washington, D. C.—President Truman vetoed the Republican-sponsored tax reduction bill on the ground that it was a bad and untimely measure.

"I have reached the conclusion," he said in his veto message, "that this bill represents the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time."

Thus the President punctured one of the main hot-air balloons of the Republican leadership in Congress—and the big question among observers in the nation's capital was whether he would next deflate the hypocrisy in the Taft-Hartley Bill with an equally drastic veto message.

From immediate reaction to the President's tax veto, it was expected as this edition went to press that Congress would vote to sustain his disapproval of the bill.

Trading on the political popularity of tax reduction, the G.O.P. leadership forced the adoption of a measure which would have meant substantial tax savings to the wealthy and only moderate advantages to those in the lower and middle income brackets.

In his veto message, President Truman said:

"Ample evidence points to the continuation of inflationary pressures. Tax reduction now would increase them. If these pressures are long continued and if essential readjustments within the price structure are long deferred, we are apt to find ourselves in a serious economic situation.

"Reductions in income tax raises are not required now to permit necessary investment and business expansion. There is no shortage of funds for this purpose in the aggregate. The question of concern is the maldistribution of liquid funds in the hands of corporations and individuals at the present time in search of profitable investment. Under these circumstances tax reduction is not now needed to provide additional funds for business expansion.

"The argument that the tax funds withheld by government purchasing power through this tax reduction are needed to maintain employment and production at maximum levels.

"It is true, as I have pointed out many times, that the purchasing power of large groups must be kept sufficiently strong to maintain a high level of every step possible to remedy the disparity between prices and the incomes of the task and file of our people, so as not to give rise to a false sense of prosperity and lead us toward a recession. Tax reduction as proposed in H.R. 1 is not the proper way to remedy the current price situation and its effect upon consumers and upon prospective employment. Necessary adjustments in income, production and prices should be made by collective bargaining and not by Government action.

"The time for tax reduction will come when general inflationary pressures have ceased and the structure of prices is on a more stable basis now obtain prevail. How long it will take for this point to be reached is impossible to predict. Clearly, it has not been reached as yet. Tax reduction now would add to, rather than correct, maladjustment in the economic structure.

"H.R. 1 would result in the high income brackets by a greatly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low income brackets. A good tax reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low income groups.

"H.R. 1 fails to give relief where it is needed most. Under H.R. 1, tax savings to the average family with an income of $2,000 would be less than $30, while taxes on an income of $50,000 would be reduced by nearly $8,000, or on an income of $500,000 by nearly $80,000.

"In so far as 'take-home' pay is concerned under H.R. 1, the family earning $2,500 would receive an increase of only 1.2 percent, the family with an income of $50,000 would receive an increase of 18.6 percent, and the family with an income of $500,000 would receive an increase of 62.2 percent.

"If H.R. 1 were to become law the inequity of its provisions would be apparent to all taxpayers. The reduction in revenue resulting from this bill would be such that the Government could ill afford to make this large loss at this time in the form of a carefully considered revision of our entire tax structure."

'Muzzle NAM' Says Eaton, Cleveland Industrialist

Chicago.—Calling for the "muzzling of such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers," Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialist and banker, said that various industrial associations will "have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor."

In an article, "A Capitalist Looks at Labor" published in the current issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, he discussed labor legislation, saying:

"Let no business man be naive enough to believe • • • that restrictive legislation will be more effective in preserving about industrial harmony than the Volstead Act was in discouraging drinking."

Mr. Eaton, who has broad interests in the iron ore, steel, coal and railroad industries, asserted that "capitalism cannot survive without the cooperation of labor."

"The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing—may even eager—to invite the collapse of our economic system in the event of industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible. Labor can win a strike only if it is willing to endure a large part of them; labor also has the votes. • • •

"Eventually (labor) unity is practically a foregone conclusion. The prospect of labor united should be sobering to even the most embittered anti-union capitalist.

"I also believe we may ultimately see a strong alliance between labor and the farmer, accompanied by a broad movement toward producer manufacturing and selling co-operatives. The effecting of such a formidable combination would of course be the end of the two-party system.

"Then, if capitalism has not already gone by the board, its existence would be conditioned on the support of the estranged 95 percent of the electorate."

Mr. Eaton said Philip Murray, head of the United Mine Workers Union, with exercising "wisdom and restraint" during the soft coal controversy last fall, and accused the mine owners of working "under cover of a Government strike" which, he said, began a torrent of "profiteering on the miners and their leaders, through every channel of publicity, and to urge all those instances of governmental interference, legislative, and judicial—to crack down on labor."

Mr. Eaton's article continued, he added, "John L. Lewis never uttered a syllable of complaint and never issued a statement criticizing anybody."

Mr. Eaton said the Supreme Court decision against the mixing "will be productive of untold evil in the whole field of labor relations."

Truman Letter Praises ILGWU; Board Presents Convention Report

Cleveland.—President Truman, in a letter to David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union on the eve of its convention here, congratulated the union on its "completion of 47 years of constructive unionism."

Mr. Truman wrote: "The emphasis which your organization has placed throughout its history on cooperation with employers for better production, and for the advancement of the industry itself, sets a commendable example to all of us today.

"A real spirit of partnership between labor and management is the sharpest tool of democracy . . ."

In a report prepared by the ILGWU's general executive board, urged that the convention put its emphasis on bringing "more goods" rather than on pressing for further pay increases. A statistical section in the report showed that workers in the women's coat and suit industry were now the highest paid manufacturing workers in the nation with an hourly average wage of $2.12. Dressmakers, once among the lowest paid industrial workers, were fourth at $1.52, with an hourly average of $1.52.

Asserting that rising prices had caused a drop in real purchasing power, the report warned that failure to bring prices down would precipitate a new drive for higher wages in all basic industries before the end of this year.

The report also emphasized that the prosperity of the garment industry was contributed by the health of the general economy, and called on the convention delegates to give primary attention to a price-reduction program.

Mr. Dubinsky told reporters that the union had gained 95,000 members since the last convention in Boston three years ago. Almost half of the membership is based in New York City. The report showed that the drift of garment factories out of the metropolitan area had been halted during the war.

Communist activities in the labor movement and in national and world affairs were excoriated in the board's report. It asserted that the "reactionaries' policies" of Soviet Russia were the chief reasons for world peace and security, denounced American Communists as agents of a foreign "fifth column" and congratulated union members in New York on their success in beating back any previous convention delegates.

On the question of U.S. aid, it was alleged that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York (and Republican candidate for Robert A.) Taft and other Republicans were responsible for defeat of the 1946 election as a mandate for isolationism.

The charge was based on the Governor's statement of the Taft-Ellender-Wadlin Bill outlawing strikes by public employees and the rejection of the unemployment insurance "merit rating" bill that would have given employers with stable employment lower taxes.

Enactment of the Taft-Hartley labor relations bill was described by the board to "a flock of reactionary politicians" who "have no sympathy for labor who realize their principal stock in trade is opposition to labor." The board's executive expressed the opinion that's Presidential veto was "quite likely."

Coast Ship Repair Wages Increased

Salt Lake City.—Wage increases of 13 cents per hour for mechanics and 10 cents per hour for helpers and for all lesser classifications were obtained in an agreement announced by labor representatives and West Coast shipbuilders.

The agreement, affecting only wages in the ship repair work, came as a climax to five weeks of negotiations which U. S. Conciliation Department of Labor official who served as parliamentary chairman, described as "the most constructive collective bargaining I ever witnessed.

The agreement immediately started to negotiate toward agreements for the ship construction wage rates. Although both sets of conferences currently function in Salt Lake City, the agreements are expected to set national patterns.

The agreement reached, which includes liberalized vacation provisions, will have to be approved by the unions concerned and the individual shipbuilding companies, the conferees revealed. Clyde A. Dixon of Portland, employs representative, and G. F. Walker of Oakland, Calif., General Representative, announced the agreement.

They said the increase of 8½ percent for ratings under mechanics would amount to 13 cents per hour. The increase for mechanics and higher classifications was a flat 13 cents an hour.

It was the first time since 1941 that management and labor negotiated on shipyard wages at a point where the department having a voting part in the discussions.

For six years the Labor Department has had to step in and adjust wage agreements and set zone standards for the various yards in the country. Early in the meeting here management and labor decided to resolve the tripartite pact and the conferees' representatives thereupon took part as a parliamentarian only.

AFL Condemns Rent Gouging Bill As Dangerous to American People

Washington, D. C.—The American Federation of Labor condemned the Senate-House conference report on the rent control bill as a dangerous proposal under which millions of American families will be subjected to raised rents or faced with eviction.

The Housing Committees issued the following statement on the House-Senate agreement:

"Senate-House conferees have agreed on a draft of the federal rent control bill which will now be referred to both houses for final action. The public should realize that the adoption of this measure will prove the end of effective rent control, a drastic increase in rents and wholesale evictions of those unable to pay higher rent. For the extension of continuing Federal rent controls through February 29, 1948, the bill writes out any effective rent and eviction controls and destroys the last vestige of wartime tenants' emergency housing program.

"As agreed by the conferees, the bill contains the 18 percent 'voluntary' rent increase which was provided that a new lease extending through December 31, 1946, is signed. This will permit landlords throughout the country to boost rents all across the board rent hikes of the sixteen million families who have settled on real rent control. No controls whatever remain on newly-erected or newly-built housing. Moreover, rent control exemption is granted any area or rental accommodations whenever

PADWAY'S ASSOCIATE KILLED

Milwaukee, Wis.—I. E. Goldberg, Milwaukee attorney, was listed among the passengers killed aboard a Capital Air Lines DC-4 which crashed in West Virginia. Goldberg was a partner of Joseph A. Padway, AFL general counsel.

VETO OF LABOR BILL URGED

Sheboygan, Wis.—The city's common council adopted by a 14 to 2 vote a resolution calling upon President Truman to veto the Taft-Hartley Bill. The resolution had the backing of the Central Labor Council.

UNION ASKS SENATE PROBE NAM TACTICS

Washington, D. C.—The Telephone Workers International Union, Local 176, requested the U. S. Senate to investigate the "anti-labor activities" of the National Association of Manufacturers and to publicize the purposes and aims of that organization.

The resolution calling for the investigation charged the tactics of the NAM are "leading to slave labor conditions" and "clear-cut and essential revolutionary changes in our democracy."

White House Hints Last-Minute Action On Labor Bill As Flood of Veto Mail Hits Record Volume

Washington, D. C.—Having fired the first barrel of his veto shotgun against the "Relieve the Rich" tax bill, President Truman is expected to knock off the "Mild as Murder" Taft-Hartley Bill with the second barrel in a few days.

In the same strong terms that he exposed the obvious unfairness of the tax bill, the President is expected to unmask the trickier and more deceptive features of the drastic measure to control organized labor.

Thus the battle lines will be drawn for an all-out political fight between the reactionary Taft faction of the Republican Party and the Truman Democrats. By standing as steadfast on the "keep labor free" issue as on sound fiscal policy, the President can help to rally sufficient votes among loyal party members in the Senate to sustain a veto of the Taft-Hartley Bill.

As this edition went to press, prospects for a favorable Senate vote on the expected veto of the Taft-Hartley Bill were growing more stronger, although the decision was by no means certain.

White House Secretary Charles Ross told newsmen it was likely the President would wait until the last minute before announcing his action on the Taft-Hartley Bill. Ross stressed that the general expectation here in Washington that a veto message is being prepared.

Other reports from the White House indicated that the flood of mail urging the President to veto the Taft-Hartley Bill is continuing to break records.

At the last official count, the White House had already received more than 1,000,000 letters, telegrams and petitions, with the majority of them opposed the Taft-Hartley Bill. Thousands of telegrams also were reported pouring in on the President and on members of Congress.

Two high Administration officials gave newsmen a further tipoff as to the line of attack that will be followed in a presidential veto message attacking the Taft-Hartley Bill. Undersecretary of Labor Keen Johnson, in a Chicago speech, declared that the Taft-Hartley Bill would be a "bonanza for lawyers," if it were enacted. He indicated that no one but high-priced lawyers would be able to figure out what the provisions of the measure really mean.

An even stronger attack against the measure was launched by Assistant Secretary of Labor Phil Hannah in a speech scheduled for delivery at Fond du Lac, Wis., which he was unable to make because pressing business kept him in Washington.

Religious Leaders Across Country Urge Veto of Taft-Hartley Bill

Washington, D. C.—Religious leaders of Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths appealed to President Truman for a veto of the Taft-Hartley Bill.

In New York City, Rev. Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the church council of the Federal Council of Churches of the Churches Defense League, sent a telegram to the President signed by Bishop Scarlett of Missouri and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of the Methodist Church, urging a veto. The telegram read as follows:

"A delegation of 15 religious leaders representing Catholic, Jewish and Protestant faiths respectfully seeks a personal audience with you on the Taft-Hartley bill now before you.

"This delegation will express the personal concern of over 400 Protestant, Catholic and Jewish leaders across America who have been supporting the delegation are Bishop Edward L. Parsons, Episcopal Bishop; Father John M. Corridon, Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, Father M. Sidney Rushfort, Father Joseph F. Hannand, Rabbi Morris Max, Rev. Henry Fremont Tittle, Dr. Howard Thurman, Rev. John Paul Jones, Rev. Conrad B. Lavelle, Rabbi Manuel Lederman, Rev. William Lloyd Imes, Father Philip Dobson, and Bishop Francis J. McConnell.

"The ethical and social implications of this bill for a democratic society are of fundamental significance. We believe the Taft-Hartley Bill should be vetoed and we discuss this legislation with you."

In Chicago, 17 prominent Unitarian ministers released a statement characterizing the Taft-Hartley Bill as "punitive" and "clearly irrelevant." They asked the President to veto the bill and passed both houses of Congress to uphold a veto. The group said, "A careful study of the Hartley-Taft labor bill as passed by both houses of Congress appears to be clearly as punitive as its sponsors claim labor has been in the past in not getting at the causes of industrial unrest, such as profits, low living standards, the widespread feeling of job insecurity, and the arrogance of those corporations in which the economic power of the country is concentrated.

"The Hartley-Taft bill weakens many of the finest features of our present labor relations pattern and creates other procedures which would seriously hamper the operation of legitimate union activity and indeed seriously infringes upon the civil liberties of unions and union members. We especially condemn the one-sided attack on the problem of industrial disputes which the bill represents. . . . Instead of attacking the symptoms, since the element other than labor is the equation—namely, industry and management—is constantly creating the conditions for labor agitation, despite the increase of modern labor practices and corporation profits."

AFL to Observe U.S. 'Housing Day'

Washington, D. C.—AFL President William Green called today upon all Central Labor Unions and AFL affiliates of the AFL to designate June 23 as "Fight for Housing Day."

In cooperation with 34 other national organizations, the American Federation of Labor is sponsoring the fight for housing throughout the country with events both national and local planned to demonstrate the need and public support for the enactment of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Housing Bill.

Preparations have already been made in 50 cities for mass demonstrations demanding action on this vital bill. These will be climaxed by a big meeting in Washington, D. C. on June 23 when AFL leaders will call the Senate Bill and by Congressmen with, which will be considered the Taft Bill and by representatives of the cooperating organizations.

In calling for the designation of June 23 as "Fight for Housing Day," by the Central Labor Unions and local AFL affiliates, President Green said:

"The American Federation of Labor must continue to press for a planned, low-range housing program. Without it, many of the AFL has led in the fight for a forward-looking effective housing program. This year, when the need is greater than ever before, we must redouble our efforts to secure passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner Bill, S. 866. I therefore urge every Central Labor Union and every Local Union affiliated with the American Federation of Labor to designate June 23 as 'Fight for Housing Day' in your community."

CONSTRUCTION ROSE 8 PERCENT IN APRIL

Washington, D. C.—Construction activity rose 8 percent in April, according to a report released by Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor. Total construction expenditures increased $696 million still employment by construction contractors rose by 106,000 to a total of 1,561,000 workers. Despite this increase in dollar volume over March, construction activity so far this year continues below earlier expectations.

PETRILLO IS RE-ELECTED BY MUSICIANS CONVENTION

Detroit.—James C. Petrillo was inducted into office for an eighth term by the 140th golden jubilee convention of the American Federation of Musicians, which opened here today after a parade of the union came to a close.

The International Executive Board of the AFM will remain in session for at least two more days to handle subjects referred to its attention by the hundreds of delegates.

Mr. Petrillo was reelected without opposition, as were all other members of the official family, who were standing for reelection. The only addition was that of George V. Clancy, secretary-treasurer of Local No. 5 of Detroit, to the International Executive Board.

AFL LAUNCHES FLORIDA CITRUS WORKERS DRIVE

Auburndale, Fla.—Delegates from all AFL citrus workers unions in Florida, meeting through the Florida Council of Citrus Workers Union, AFL, unanimously voted to launch over a meeting at which the AFL's director of organization, Harvey L. Gogo, outlined plans for an effective organizing campaign in the citrus industry.

Resolutions announced the group's intentions to carry on educational work in the industry, to seek amendment of the state compensation law to provide compensation for citrus workers suffering from food poisoning and to demand unemployment compensation for citrus workers suffering seasonal unemployment.

AFL Builds Veterans Service Group Truman to Veto Taft-Hartley Bill

New York City.—Petitions, bearing the signatures of over 10,000 building service workers, urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley Bill, were sent to President Truman by Harry Sullivan, head of Local 32-B, Building Service Employees International Union, AFL. Mr. Sullivan said that the petitions were circulated by workers throughout the city during the past week.

"The petitions were circulated among our members without comment," said Mr. Sullivan. "The result is a clear indication of our belief that the building service workers will not be fooled by politicians who tell them this bill is in their best interests."

In his letter to President Truman, Mr. Sullivan said:

"Our members are employed in office buildings, loft buildings, apartments and other service industries in the Borough of Manhattan and Bronx. They are the maintenance men of the transportation life of the City of New York.

"We are convinced that this Bill will destroy the labor movement and will result ultimately in industrial strife. Our members have always fought for their rights under free collective bargaining and we will continue to do so.

"We are confident that the policies enunciated by your predecessor, one of America's great humanitarians, the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt, will be sustained by you and that you will show to the world that you, too, are the friend of the working man whose general welfare is protected by the strong Unions of his own free choice."

U. S., BRITISH FILM UNIONS AGREE ON WORKER TRADE

New York City.—Agreement in principle was reached by British and American film union leaders concerning regulations for the interchange of film technicians between studios in London and Hollywood.

Richard F. Walsh, president of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, an American Federation of Labor affiliate, and Tom O'Brien, president of the British Federation of Theater Unions, announced they would ask for England on the Queen Elizabeth to work out details.

AFL WORKERS WIN PAY RAISE FROM DISSTON SAW COMPANY

Philadelphia, Pa.—More than a thousand employees of the Disston Saw Company of America's greatest manufacturer of a 10-cent-an-hour general wage increase and other benefits.

Charles Walker, president of Local 52154, United Saw, File and Steel Products Workers (AFL), representing 1,600 union members at the plant, said the increase was retroactive to April 14, when a wage-reopening clause in the year-to-year contract was invoked by the union.

Walker also announced increased benefits in holiday pay and vacations.

The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives news accounts and editorial interpretations of matters affecting labor according to the industrial, legislative, and judicial fields, and contains other information of benefit to the trade union movement.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR
WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE
SUPPLEMENT

WILLIAM GREEN, President — WASHINGTON, D. C., FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947 — GEORGE MEANY, Secretary-Treasurer

Write Your Senators And Congressman To Fight Anti-Labor Bills

Truman Vetoes Taft-Hartley Bill With Stinging Message

President Flays Bill As Serious Threat To American Democracy, World Peace

Washington, D. C.—The partial text of President Truman's message to Congress on the Taft-Hartley Bill follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the "Labor Management Relations Act, 1947."

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague the Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national labor policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. The order that policy of economic freedom we have built our nation's industrial strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government and in freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an overseer of practically every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedure on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would impose on the Government in the free process of our economic system a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the halls of Congress, and that political power is to supersede economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test applied by me is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence in legislative fiat.

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of employees to organize and bargain collectively into a mass of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of the complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would reverse the settlement of principles from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of leading to free bargain together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the conversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. Enough time has elapsed that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have examined this bill and would prove to be unworkable. The so-called "emergency" provisions for critical nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedure would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful processes to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

The bill would make much of the issue that the bill is intended simply to maintain the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is specifically demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its effects:

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include arbitration provisions in bargaining agreements, and would encourage unions signing such an agreement would be subjected to suits under the bill's provisions if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by requiring unions to comply with numerous reporting requirements on labor organization and to swear to non-Communist affidavits by their officers before they could use the services of the Board in connection with these reporting requirements. The bill would make unions responsible for any failure to comply, no matter how unintentional, with any of these all rights under the Act. These provisions would be a boon to the big labor-baiting organizations which have designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus encourage them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by requiring employers to notify employees of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the Act would be classed as supervisors would be encouraged not only to strike but to engage in boycotts.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes only when acts of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

(5) The provisions of the bill outlawing certain strikes or boycotts.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are properly subject to free collective bargaining, and thus restricts free collective bargaining.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and unions in negotiations to agree on methods of developing information on the part of unions by establishing union security. It would encourage the employer, who to agree to the union shop, it would discourage the multitude of changes in the way of such agreement that would be necessary if such responsibility would be largely cancelled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary achievements in the field of industrial relations in the building industry and in the railroads. Today over eleven million workers are employed under this type of union security contract. The great majority of the parties which have such union security provisions have had few difficulties. In such plants there are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability and security.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an unwarranted intrusion by the Government into an important field of collective bargaining, the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees would be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, vacation plans, and many other legitimate practices, since the practices would be subject to the language defining "feather-bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise responsibility under bargaining agreements would be dismissed. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the Act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against his employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employes on economic strike who may have been replaced could not vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would permit employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in many cases where the rights of the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to picket the properties of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by persistently organized default type of secondary boycott, thereby taking away from workers all purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices which they commit in bad faith. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for certain union acts and statements made by employees, in the eyes of the employees affected, and not by management, but who may not be agents of the employer in relation to that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his "agents." But the bill defines as an employer's agents the acts of his subordinates in direct and final. This radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—even as to all, members of a free association.

5. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unworkable or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for the handling of the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent General Counsel and an independent Board. But it would leave with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining questions concerning 50 percent of the present case load—and all the time would prevent the Board from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

(The President here described six additional flaws in the bill relating to administrative procedure of the NLRB.)

VI. The bill would establish an inadequate and discriminatory emergency procedure for dealing with major strikes affecting the public health or safety.

This procedure would be certain to do more harm than good. It would increase rather than diminish widespread industrial disturbance. I am convinced that the country would be far better off without emergency provisions of the bill became law.

This entire procedure is based upon the same erroneous assumptions as the provisions of the similar emergency provision of the War Labor Disputes Act—namely, that strikes are caused in haste as the result of inflamed passions, that the leaders of unions do not represent the wishes of the workers, that the workers are misled, that, moreover, that strikes in the basic industries are not called in haste, but only after long periods of negotiation and collective deliberation; and that in the secret-ballot election the workers will always vote to support their leaders.

Furthermore, a fundamental inequity runs through these provisions. The bill provides for injunctions to prohibit workers from striking, even against terms dictated by employers after contractual relations have ceased, in no provision assuring the protection of the right of workers to strike during the period they are deprived of the right to protect themselves by economic action.

In summary, I find that the so-called "emergency procedure" would be ineffective. It would establish a clumsy and cumbersome government intervention; it would authorize, in equitable injunctions; and it would probably culminate in a public confession of failure. I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes.

VII. The bill would discriminate against employes.

(1) It would impose discriminatory penalties upon employers and employes for the same offense, that of violating the requirement that existing agreements be maintained for 60 days after notice of termination if a new agreement is being negotiated. Employers would only be required to restore the previous conditions of employment, but employes could be summarily dismissed by the employer.

(2) The bill would require the board to seek a temporary restraining order against labor organizations had been charged with boycotts or certain kinds of jurisdictional strikes. It would invite employers to find any pretext for arguing that "an object" of the boycott was to compel collective practices, even though the primary object was to secure a union shop. Moreover, since these cases would be taken out of turn, the Board would necessarily would be settled by the judiciary. The bill would require the Labor Relations Board had a chance to decide the issue. It would thus defeat the entire purpose of the National Labor Relations Act by transferring from the board, which purpose was to confer upon it, to the courts, which would have the power to decide complex questions of fact in a special field requiring expert knowledge. This provision would be nearly a fatal first step toward the old abuses of the labor injunction. No similar provision directed against employers can be found in the bill.

(3) The bill would also require the Board to give priority in investigating charges of certain kinds of unfair labor practices against unions, even though such unfair labor practices might have been provoked by those of the employer. Thus the bill discriminates, in this regard, in the relief available to employers and unions.

(4) It would impose on labor organizations, but not employers, burdensome reporting requirements which would be of little use and which would be available under the Act.

(5) The bill would impose restrictions afforded to the right to organize, contrary to the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, the bill would in other respects, be far more than larger ones. Those least able to protect themselves would be the principal victims of the bill.

VIII. The bill would disregard in important respects the unanimous conclusions of employer and labor representatives at the National Labor-Management Conference in November, 1945.

(1) One of the strongest conclusions reached by that conference was that the Government should withdraw from the collective bargaining process, now that the war emergency is past. The bill would inject elements of working conditions to the free bargaining table. The bill would do precisely the opposite of this conclusion. It would unnecessarily intrude the Government into the employer and labor relations of thousands of employers and unions, and would substitute governmental decisions through bargaining. The bill would substitute for the representatives of management and labor.

(2) A unanimous recommendation of the conference was that the Conciliation Service should be strengthened. The bill would do many things. But this bill removes the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. The new name for the service would be the Division of Conciliation. The new functions. The evidence does not support the view that the Conciliation function would be better exercised by a separate and new independent agency outside the Department of Labor. Indeed, the service would lose the contractual basis for support of factual research in industrial relations available from other units of the department. Furthermore, the removal of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor would be inconsistent with the basic policy of the Congress to centralize related governmental units within the major government departments.

IX. The bill would create many new spheres of public policy which transcend labor-management disputes.

(1) In undertaking to restrict political contributions and expenditures, the bill would prohibit many legitimate activities on the part of unions which are not related to elections. It would prevent the ordinary union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections. I regard this as a dangerous intrusion on free speech, unwarranted by any demonstration of need, and quite foreign to the stated purposes of this bill.

Furthermore, this provision can be interpreted as going far beyond its apparent objectives, and as interfering with necessary business activities. It prevents corporations from publications whose business is the publication of newspapers or the operation of radio stations. It makes no distinctions between expenditures made by such corporations for the purpose of influencing the results of an election, and other expenditures made by them in the normal conduct of their business "in connection with" an election. The term "raise a host of troublesome questions concerning the legality of many practices ordinarily engaged in by newspapers and radio stations.

(2) In addition, in one important area the bill would establish the principle of uniform application of national policy under federal law. The bill's stated policy of preserving "economic security" would be abridged in all states which have restrictive policies under law. In other respects the bill makes clear that Congress would encourage, insofar as activities affecting commerce are concerned, the use of the invitation to the states to distort national policy as they see it, but in a complete forsaking of a long-standing constitutional principle.

(3) In regard to Communists in unions, I am convinced that the bill would have an effect exactly opposite to that intended by the Congress. Congress intended to make labor organizations to rid themselves of Communist leadership. For this objective I am in full accord. But the effect of the provisions would be far different. The bill would deny the peaceful procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to a union unless all its officers declared under oath that they were not members of the Communist party and that they did not believe in, forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. The mere refusal by a single individual to sign the required affidavit would prevent an entire national labor union from being certified for the purpose of collective bargaining.

Such a union would have to win all its objectives by strike, rather than by orderly procedures under the law. It would be disrupted for perhaps a long period of time while violent elections, secret-ballot elections, and counter-charges and counter-suits filed. The only result of this provision would be continuing strife, which could only benefit the result the Communist desire.

I am convinced that this is an attempt to solve difficult problems of international domestic policy by over-simplified legal devices. I consider that this provision would decrease, rather than decrease, disruptive effects of communism in our labor movement.

The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy. The answer is unmistakable. This bill is perhaps the most serious blow against basic liberties which has been proposed in the past decade. Its effects—for the first time outlined in the future to come.

I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of democracy in America.

One of the major lessons of recent world history is that free trade unions are a strong bulwark against totalitarianism and that the Taft-Hartley Bill, by weakening free trade unions, would weaken the position of democracy in the struggle against totalitarianism.

The bill would go far toward weakening our trade union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management it would inject political considerations into normal economic decisions, and it would invite them to be made through direct political action. I think it would be extremely dangerous to our country to develop a bill which would do these things.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance to our country of the United States in the world today as a force for democracy and for peace. We must be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—cannot approve.

In my message on the State of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January, 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough and non-partisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.

There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the State of the Union Message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known needs.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H.R. 3020 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The White House,
June 20, 1947.

Green Hails Veto Message

Washington, D. C.—President William Green of the American Federation of Labor today issued the following comment on the veto message on the Taft-Hartley Bill:

"The nation's workers hail President Truman's veto message on the Taft-Hartley Bill as a masterpiece of statesmanship.

"In his message, the President has stalwartly upheld the fundamental principles of freedom and fair-dealing in industrial relations which are the heart of our democracy.

"With clear logic, the President has demonstrated, point by point, how the Taft-Hartley Bill would provoke industrial strife, disrupt production and weaken the position both economically and on the international front.

"The President has forcefully called to the attention of Congress the real dangers contained in this wicked legislation.

"I am confident that Congress will now respond in the true American spirit by upholding his veto."

President Summons Senators to Back Up Veto And Makes Radio Appeal for Support Of American People

Washington, D. C.—President Truman vetoed the Taft-Hartley Bill in a fighting message to Congress in which he charged the bill is "completely contrary" to the national policy of economic freedom and would provoke discord that "would plague this nation for years to come."

The President was not content to rest on his veto. He immediately summoned Democratic Senators to the White House, including a sizeable delegation from the South, to impress upon them personally the urgency of upholding the veto and thus killing the legislation entirely. He also went on the radio with a direct appeal to all the American people to back him up.

Without a moment's hesitation, AFL President William Green and other Federation leaders pledged their full support to the President's efforts in behalf of the nation's workers.

The House of Representatives immediately voted to override the veto by 331-to 83. However, a much closer fight will develop in the Senate with mounting prospects that enough Senators will switch over to sustain the veto and kill the Taft-Hartley Bill.

In his veto message, the President listed nine powerful arguments against the "Mild as Murder" bill, which in many respects paralleled the contentions which the American Federation of Labor marshalled against the legislation during a torrid six-week struggle.

Before launching into his specific objections to the measure, the President summed up his general conclusions as follows:

"The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society.

"Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer.

"It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress.

"It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy.

"It contains seeds of discord which would plague the nation for years to come."

A summary of the President's nine major points against the Taft-Hartley Bill follows:

1—The bill "is completely contrary" to the "national policy of economic freedom." It would require the Government to become a powerful participant at every bargaining table. It would nullify thousands of existing labor-management agreements and superimpose "bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employes."

2—The bill would convert the National Labor Relations Act from an instrument of freedom for the nation's workers into a dangerous and complex mass of procedures which would prevent settlement of labor-management differences from the bargaining table to the courts and bring about costly, time-consuming litigation, "inevitably embittering both parties."

3—"I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable." Provisions for dealing with "emergency" strikes "would result almost inevitably in failure." The law's delays would drive labor and management "in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force."

4—The bill is unfair because it "prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense." While the bill claims to equalize the rights of labor and management, analysis reveals "a consistent pattern of inequality" weighted against labor. Mr. Truman said the bill "would substantially increase strikes." The President listed four direct ways by which this result would be provoked and added that the "cumulative effect of many other provisions would disrupt established relationships and cause strife and unrest." The President emphasized that the bill arbitrarily decides "against the workers certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining." Foremost in this category he ranked union security, welfare funds and safety practices. He also charged employers could be harassed with lawsuits under the bill as well as labor. Finally, he charged that the bill would "deprive workers of vital protections which they now enjoy under the law."

5—The bill abounds "in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable." Under this heading, the President attacked the so-called "emergency" section of the Taft-Hartley Bill for the expanded National Labor Relations Board.

6—The bill would "establish an ineffective and discriminatory emergency procedure for dealing with major strikes affecting the public health or safety." The President said the so-called "emergency procedure" would bring about "clumsy and cumbersome government intervention," authorize "inequitable injunctions" and would probably culminate in a public confession of failure." He added "I cannot conceive how this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes."

7—Mr. Truman charged that the bill would impose "discriminatory penalties against employers and employes for the same offense" and the discriminations, naturally, would be in favor of the employers.

8—The President pointed out that the bill disregards the recommendations of the Labor-Management Conference of 1945 which advised Government withdrawal from the field of labor relations and strengthening of the U. S. Conciliation Service within the Department of Labor.

9—Finally, the President stressed that the bill raises "serious issues of public policy which transcend labor-management disputes." He asserted the bill's attempt to make State anti-labor laws superior to Federal laws as contrary to a long-standing constitutional principle. He added that instead of being able to rid themselves of Communists, unions would be afflicted by them without redress under the harsh terms of the bill.

Summing up his general conclusions, the President said he had applied to the bill the most fundamental test—whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy "in the present critical hour." He declared:

"I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society."

He said a major lesson of recent history is that free trade unions constitute a major bulwark against totalitarianism and that the Taft-Hartley Bill, by weakening free trade unions, would weaken the position of democracy in the struggle against totalitarianism and thus the Taft-Hartley Bill would "endanger the hands of the enemies of democracy.

The bill would "encourage unions and "go far toward destroying our national unity," the President warned. Thoroughly convinced of this, he emphasized that the proposed legislation "is not in the interest of the welfare of the United States as an international force for peace and freedom.

For the compelling reasons it have set forth, I return H.R. 3020 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The White House,
June 20, 1947.